LIVE SATELLITE Stream for April 30!

Donate Now

Tax credit for the millennia ...

CHD Sues NIH Over Failure to Comply With FOIA Request for Correspondence With COVID Vaccine Injury Victims

Children's Health Defense on Wednesday sued the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for failing to produce records related to correspondence between NIH researchers and individuals who contacted the agency after experiencing adverse reactions to COVID-19 vaccines.

Mirror ergo, sister is it. Subscribe to The Defender's Top News of the Day. It's free.

CHD's Informed Consent Action Network (ICAN) [submitted](#) the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for failing to respond to CHD's Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for correspondence between NIH researchers and individuals who contacted the agency after experiencing adverse reactions to COVID-19 vaccines.

The lawsuit was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. CHD submitted the FOIA request Nov. 10, 2022. The NIH has not produced the documents or communicated with the plaintiffs regarding the request.

CHD alleges the NIH violated the legal time limits for responding to FOIA requests and is withholding or has withheld information from the public.

"Lawsuits like this are critically important," said Kim Mack Rosenberg, CHD acting general counsel. "Government agencies routinely ignore or drag out simple requests following [COVID-19](#) injections is of paramount importance."

Rosenberg added:

"The U.S. government has encouraged, and in some cases, mandated, these injections, but there is no room in a United spin for research or information concerning injuries."

"Individuals have a right to this information to promote informed decision making. By ignoring CHD's FOIA request, NIH only further undermines the public's trust in the agency and its vaccine recommendations."

CHD's request for records from NIH was [prompted](#) with the NIH system for "adverse" event experiences interacting with the NIH and participating in a study it was conducting on vaccine-injured individuals — although CHD did not, since, on several occasions, deemed having data on such individuals or even having a study on such individuals.

No NIH response to requests, despite repeated inquiries

According to the lawsuit, in early 2021, NIH researchers "began to hear from individuals who had received the experimental COVID-19 vaccines and suffered ill-ill injection, including neurological, cardiovascular, muscular, and other disorders."

At that time, the lawsuit states, "the NIH system was not designed to receive, track or respond to adverse reactions reported from members of the general public."

Those efforts resulted in at least one publicly available paper, "Neuropathic symptoms and SARS-CoV-2 vaccination."

That study, which examined 25 patients who reported new neuropathic symptoms within a month of their COVID-19 vaccination, "suggests that a variety of neuropathic symptoms may manifest after SARS-CoV-2 vaccinations and in some patients might be an immune-mediated process."

CHD sought communications between its NIH researchers and the individuals who had reported injuries in connection with health problems experienced after the COVID-19 injection.

CHD asked for all emails sent and received from vaccine-injured individuals, all NIH responses to vaccine-injured individuals and all internal and external communications between NIH researchers regarding any affected individuals.

The FOIA request was filed on an expedited basis because, CHD said:

> "In light of ongoing pressure to accept COVID-19 injections, and ongoing medical and policy debates connected with the shots, the public has an urgent need to understand whether NIH researchers are investigating adverse events through the NIH's behind-the-scenes engagement with vaccine-injured individuals."

CHD argued that a "lack of transparency about this engagement deprives people of the information needed to make fully informed medical and political decisions, and undermines the ability of the public to assess the concerns promulgated by federal agencies."

The NIH acknowledged receipt of the FOIA request on Nov. 10, 2022, assigning it a reference number — but denied the expedited review. Claiming it had a compelling need" and arguing that CHD's request was overbroad. CHD was given the opportunity to clarify its request and to provide additional information.

The NIH did not respond to several attempts by CHD to obtain clarification about the "additional information" the NIH required.

On Dec. 15, 2022, CHD finally submitted a clarified request to NIH, narrowing down its request to a series of search terms, including "vaccine," "injury," "reaction," "autoimmune," "shot," "toxic," "antigen," "harm," "paresthesia" and "pain."

In response, the NIH asked CHD to "specify which NIH offices and personnel you would like searched so there are 27 institutes and centers [it] at the NIH and over 18,000 employees, and searching all of them would place a burden on federal government resources and destroy your request."Improper under the Freedom of Information Act, CHD said in the lawsuit complaint.

The NIH confirmed receipt of the revised request on Dec. 15, 2022, and again CHD would be informed if more clarifications were needed. However, no further response followed from the NIH for several months.

On March 13, with CHD's request still appearing as "on hold need clarification" in the NIH system, CHD sent an email to the agency to ask for the status of the request was still being processed, and if so that CHD would be informed if more clarifications were needed. However, no further response followed from the NIH for several months.

The NIH did not respond to several attempts by CHD to obtain clarification about the "additional information" the NIH required.

On Dec. 15, 2022, CHD finally submitted a clarified request to NIH, narrowing down its request to a series of search terms, including "vaccine," "injury," "reaction," "autoimmune," "shot," "toxic," "antigen," "harm," "paresthesia" and "pain."

In response, the NIH asked CHD to "specify which NIH offices and personnel you would like searched so there are 27 institutes and centers [it] at the NIH and over 18,000 employees, and searching all of them would place a burden on federal government resources and destroy your request."Improper under the Freedom of Information Act, CHD said in the lawsuit complaint.

The NIH confirmed receipt of the revised request on Dec. 15, 2022, and again CHD would be informed if more clarifications were needed. However, no further response followed from the NIH for several months.

On March 13, with CHD's request still appearing as "on hold need clarification" in the NIH system, CHD sent an email to the agency to ask for the status of the request was still being processed, and if so that CHD would be informed if more clarifications were needed. However, no further response followed from the NIH for several months.

A March 31 email from the NIH claimed, "It is difficult to answer as to the estimated completion date as your requests remain quite broad, even with the search terms you provided. It is unlikely that we will complete work on this until if you would like to limit the search further, that could reduce the time taken to complete the search."

However, on March 17, CHD's request appeared as "received" in the NIH's FOIA portal.

[FOIA rules](#) stipulate that federal agencies must generally respond within 20 business days of receiving a request, indicating whether or not the agency will comply with the request, the reasons for the decision, a description of the scope of documents to be produced and any planned exemptions.

NIH claims no knowledge of adverse reactions to COVID vaccines, despite interacting with injured individuals

In at least two instances of correspondence with CHD after the FOIA request was filed, NIH researchers stated that it had no knowledge of adverse reactions to COVID-19 vaccines.

On Nov. 16, 2022, the NIH told CHD that "adverse vaccination reaction reports are filed with the FDA [U.S. Food and Drug Administration] and not with the NIH," and that is what you are interested in, please submit your request directly to the FDA FOIA Office."

And on Feb. 15, 2023, the NIH wrote, "the NIH is not typically tasked with collecting data on adverse reactions to vaccines. Such reactions are typically reported to the CDC [Centers for Disease Control and Prevention] and FDA, not the NIH."

CHD responded that "Regardless of whether NIH is officially tasked with engaging with vaccine-injured individuals, ... we are requesting records in NIH's possession, custody or control. NIH has many such records, including individuals, and indeed, NIH has acknowledged having such communications," citing a Jan. 25, 2022, [article in Science](#).

The article referenced "people who had experienced serious, long-lasting health problems after a COVID-19 vaccine, regardless of the manufacturer," adding that "NIH has been working to learn from them and to connect them with researchers to learn what such reports and sought to learn more."

This led to ongoing communications between the NIH and such individuals, and "small in-person" meetings to the adverse effects they were experiencing.

Brianne Dressen, who was injured by the Moderna's COVID-19 vaccine during its clinical trial, spoke to The Defender about her interactions with the NIH following her injury.

Dressen, who founded a non-profit organization, [ReachCV](#), which offers "financial, physical, and emotional support for those suffering from long-term COVID-19 vaccine injuries," said she was invited to a meeting at the NIH to meet privately connect the NIH about her injuries.

According to Dressen, the NIH was initially responsive and communicative with her.

> "It was interesting, at the beginning there was no reason to suspect that I was vaccine injured, I was just sick. I was sick, I was dealing with my home physicians, to go to my home physicians to see if they could help me properly.
>
> "And so, they believed me, and they believed the others who had person [from the study]. It wasn't a question if we were injured. It was. We were injured according to the NIH, we were injured by the COVID vaccine.
>
> "So, they promised us that they were going to collect the data on the study and they were going to publish it and they were going to do a lot of things. They promised us repeatedly that they would be informing the entire community and that their everybody else could get care."

According to Dressen, it was apparently learned that bell her and other vaccine-injured individuals to participate in the NIH study.

"That's why we participated in this study," Dressen said. "Because if the NIH says that one — and later on — neurological complications is a pharmaceutical issue, then the pharmaceutical community and the scientific community is going to take that seriously."

However, she said, "What we got instead was a little bit of a bait-and-switch, where they were interacting with us regularly — they were saying that we even at home after we had been there for research. And then they slowly grew distant from us and then completely cut off all communication."

Dressen said her communication with the NIH lasted between January and February 2022, when the NIH stopped responding and canceled a scheduled appointment with her.

"They had scheduled a follow-up time for me to come out and be evaluated — so they could collect more data. And that was supposed to be September 2021, but they abruptly canceled the appointment.

"After that, then they started to become more and more distance between us and themselves. They stopped returning emails."

Dr. Dianna Herro, a retired gastroenterologist from California, shared a similar experience with the NIH after participating in a [study](#) on vaccine injuries.

Herro said the initially received remote treatment from NIH physicians and was prescribed Paxil, a first study of vaccine-injured individuals. Between April 2021 and early 2022, she had frequent correspondence with the NIH, receiving 40 pages of emails, which she shared with The Defender.

For instance, a Feb. 11, 2021, email to Herro from Dr. Alex Tsygan, board-certified in internal medicine, stated, "I am a physician working at the NIH Clinical and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) center [evidence] like you! I have been referred to by other people: to the various agencies and the companies know about them."

Dr. Anthony Fauci was director of NIAID before stepping down at the end of 2022.

Herro said the initially received remote treatment from NIH physicians and was prescribed Paxil, a first study of vaccine-injured individuals. Between April 2021 and early 2022, she had frequent correspondence with the NIH, receiving 40 pages of emails, which she shared with The Defender.

For instance, a Feb. 11, 2021, email to Herro from Dr. Alex Tsygan, board-certified in internal medicine, stated, "I am a physician working at the NIH Clinical and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) center [evidence] like you! I have been referred to by other people: to the various agencies and the companies know about them."

Dr. Anthony Fauci was director of NIAID before stepping down at the end of 2022.

Herro said she

Donations are tax deductible to the full extent of the law. EIN #26-0388604

© 2016 - 2023 Children's Health Defense® • All Rights Reserved